

Hewlett Packard Docket No.: 200310736-1

PATENT

Remarks

Claims 1-4 and 9 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of U.S. patent 5,935,233 ("Jeddeloh"). Claims 5-8 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Jeddeloh and U.S. patent 6,510,529 ("Alexander").

Applicant respectfully asserts (see below) that the rejection of claim 1 is erroneous. Consequently, claim 1 should be allowed. And since all claims in the application ultimately depend from claim 1, the application is in condition for allowance. Applicant does not accede to the PTO's characterizations of Jeddeloh and Alexander with respect to claims 1-9 and reserves the right to address distinctions and raise arguments beyond those voiced in this paper should it become necessary or desirable to do so.

Claim 1

The office action proposes: that Jeddeloh's pci-host bridge 56 corresponds to Applicant's system bus interface device; that Jeddeloh's pci interfaces 86 and 88 correspond to Applicant's first and second i/o bus interface devices; that Jeddeloh's control switch 90 corresponds to Applicant's switching device; and that Jeddeloh's pci busses 60 and 72 correspond to Applicant's first and second intermediate busses.

But Applicant's claim 1 requires that *"the first intermediate bus couples the system bus interface device to the first I/O bus interface device"* and *"the second intermediate bus couples the system bus interface device to the switching device."*

If Jeddeloh's bridge 56 corresponds to Applicant's system bus interface device, then neither of Jeddeloh's pci busses 60 and 72 provides the connectivity that is required by Applicant's claim. Bus 60 couples pci interface 86 to a hard drive 62 and an ISA bridge 64. It does not couple pci interface 86 to bridge 56, nor does it couple pci interface 86 to control switch 90. Similarly, bus 72 couples pci interface 88 to a network 80 and a graphics controller 74—not to bridge 56 or to control switch 90. It follows that Jeddeloh does not anticipate Applicant's claim 1 under the legal standards that are applicable to 35 USC 102(b).


Hewlett Packard Docket No.: 200310736-1

PATENT

Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully asserts that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant earnestly solicits a notice to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 3/28/2006

Kevin M. Hart

Reg. No. 36,823